

### **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2005.

No claims have been amended in this response. Thus, claims 1-6 are currently pending for the Examiner's consideration.

In view of this response, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to for including reference character "50" without it being mentioned in the specification. In response to this objection, Applicants have amended the specification to indicate that reference character "50" refers to the laminate film shown in FIG. 5. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Parker et al. (U.S. Patent 4,403,004) in view of Vander Velden et al. (U.S. Patent 5,494,745). Further, claim 4 (as presumed from the content of the rejection) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Parker et al. in view of Vander Velden et al. and further in view of Sidders (U.S. Patent 4,183,975). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references, in combination, must teach or suggest the invention as a whole, including all the limitations of the claims. Here, in this case, the combination of Parker et al. and Vander Velden et al., and further in view of Sidders fails to teach or suggest the limitation "*a backing material integrally bonded to a back surface of said substrate through an adhesive layer.*"

Parker et al. teaches a decorative metallized laminate comprising a base layer prepared from a thermo-formable resin film, *with both surfaces thereof coated with vapor deposited metal layers*. In contrast, the present claims are directed to a laminate film comprising a substrate, *a metal vapor deposited layer formed on a front surface of said substrate*, a transparent resin surface layer formed on the front surface of said metal vapor deposited layer,

and *a backing material integrally bonded to a back surface of said substrate through an adhesive layer*. In other words, in the present invention, the metal vapor deposited layer is formed on the *front surface of said substrate* while a backing material is integrally bonded to the *back surface of said substrate through an adhesive layer*. By coating *both surfaces of the base layer (i.e. substrate) with vapor deposited metal layers* (see column 4, lines 58-59, of Parker et al. which states “[B]ase layer 12 is provided on both of its surfaces with tightly adherent, reflective metal coatings 14 and 16”), Parker’s laminate cannot comprise “*a backing material integrally bonded to a back surface of said substrate through an adhesive layer*” since the back surface of the base layer is already coated with a metal layer.

This deficiency in Parker et al. is not cured by the teachings and suggestions of Vander Velden et al. and Sidders. Vander Velden et al. is directed to a multilayer laminated structure and is only cited to support the Examiner’s position that conventional laminating techniques include adhesive lamination. Likewise, Sidders is directed to a vacuum metallizing process and is only cited to support the Examiner’s position that the capping layer of Parker et al. can be modified to comprise urethane-based resin.

Thus, since the combination of the cited references fail to teach or suggest “*a backing material integrally bonded to a back surface of said substrate through an adhesive layer*”, this rejection can no longer be sustained and should be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: March 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Nikaido

Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.